

IN THE UNITED STATES OFFICE OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

Applicant: Kattalaicheri Srinivasan Venkataramani,:

et al.

Serial Number: 10/656,518 : Group Art Unit: 3746

Filed: September 5, 2003 : Examiner: Kim, Tae Jun

For: METHOD AND APPARATUS FOR OPERATING GAS TURBINE ENGINES

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING BY EXPRESS MAIL TO THE COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

Express Mail mailing label number: EV 593382918 US

Date of Mailing: June 16, 2005

I certify that the documents listed below:

- Certificate of Express Mailing (1 pg.)
- Issue Fee Transmittal (1 pg., in duplicate)
- Comments on Statements of Reasons for Allowance (2 pgs.)
- Return Post Card

are being deposited with the United States Postal Service "Express Mail Post Office to Addressee" service under 37 C.F.R. §1.10 on the date indicated above in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop: ISSUE FEE, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

Robert B. Reeser, III

Reg. No. 45,548

ARMSTRONG TEASDALE LLP
One Metropolitan Square, Suite 2600

St. Louis, MO 63102-2740

(314) 621-5070

PATENT Atty. Dkt. No. 132657

Express Mail No. EV 593382918US

JUN 1 6 2005

Applicant

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant: Kattalaicheri Venkataramani, et al.

Art Unit: 3746

Serial No.: 10/656,518

Examiner: Tae Jun Kim

Filed: September 5, 2003

For: METHODS AND APPARATUS FOR OPERATING GAS

TURBINE ENGINES

COMMENTS ON STATEMENT OF REASONS FOR ALLOWANCE

Mail Stop ISSUE FEE Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313

Sir:

The following comments are in response to the Examiner's Statement of Reasons for Allowance in the Notice of Allowability dated April 20, 2005.

Applicants believe that the Statement of Reasons for Allowance in this case is improper as it merely copies portions of each limitation of the independent claim into the reasons for allowance. While Applicants believe that the claims are allowable, Applicants do not acquiesce that patentability resides in each feature, exactly as expressed in the claims, nor that each feature is required for patentability.

Also, reasons for allowance are only warranted in instances in which the record of the prosecution as a whole does not make clear the Examiner's reasons for allowing a claim or claims (see 37 CFR §1.104(e)). In the present case, Applicants believe the record as a whole does make the reasons for allowance clear and therefore no statement by the Examiner is necessary or warranted. Furthermore, Applicants do not necessarily agree with each statement in the reasons for allowance and do not necessarily agree with the Examiner's interpretation of the teachings of the cited art.

Respectfully Submitted,

Robert B. Reeser II

Registration No. 45,548
ARMSTRONG TEASDALE LLP
One Metropolitan Square, Suite 2600 St. Louis, Missouri 63102-2740

(314) 621-5070